

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/522,051	01/20/2005	Keijo Imelainen	7633-0001WOUS	3980	
	7590 01/04/200 , PAULDING & HUB	EXAMINER			
CITY PLACE	II	CORDRAY, DENNIS R			
185 ASYLUM STREET HARTFORD, CT 06103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/04/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/522,051	IMELAINEN, KEIJO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Dennis Cordray	1791		

	Dennis Cordray	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice oving replies: (1) an amendment, a tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid aba ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		•
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN T	ing date of the final reject	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 tension and the corresponding amour shortened statutory period for reply or than three months after the mailing of	it of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		OTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			4b - 1 6
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially i	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affid	avit or other evidence i	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	hed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	A L. NOT. L. What are Profited	to a selection for all access	
 11.			ince because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			
•			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, feeding a fuel gas substantially continuously does not define a time period, but can mean substantially continuous feeding for short periods of time, such as during the startup of a boiler, or for an extended period, such as during the entire time the boiler is in operation. In addition, other operating characteristics related to the apparatus are not defined in the claim, such as gas pressure, flow rate, etc, all of which are required to design a proper connection between the gas outlet means and the feed unit of the boiler. The limitation as claimed thus fails to adequately define the intended operational characteristics of the apparatus as argued.

Regarding the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, continuously feeding fuel gas during the burning of the concentrated liquor in the soda recovery boiler is unsupported by the portions of the Specification cited by the Applicant. At best, the cited lines teach burning of gas produced in accordance with the process with the concentrated liquor in the soda recovery boiler. The cited paragraph 31 relates to the production of excess electricity. The numerical benefits cited in the current response are discussed in paragraph 30 and appear to be related to replacement of the heavy fuel oil of the lime sludge burning kiln with the fuel gas of the invention, rather than burning the gas in the recovery boiler. Paragraph 30 also discusses in much less detail additional benefits of decreasing detrimental emmissions and increasing the economy of the soda recovery boiler. Continuous supplying of the gas to the soda recovery boiler is not disclosed.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The instant Specification fails to define what is intended by continuously supplying gas and does not specify that the gas is fed into the soda recovery boiler substantially continuously during the burning of the concentrated liquor is burned in the soda recovery boiler.

The use of auxilliary fuel gas in the soda recovery boiler is known in the prior art, during startup (Kuusio et al, Shaw et al), to increase production of steam to meet demands (Shaw et al), and to maintain operating temperatures (Tomlinson II). None of the mentioned processes is instantaneous, thus, supplying the auxilliary gas continuously for at least some period of time would have been obvious. Production of fuel gas by gasifying bark, wood, wood chips, etc. is known (Saviharju et al). Production of fuel gas by gasifying some of the waste liquor in the process is known (Kuusio et al). Directing some of the produced gas to the soda recovery boiler is known (Kuusio et al). One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to supply fuel gas produced by gasifying bark, wood, wood chips or any other waste material to any area of the process where it is needed to minimize the need to purchase fuel externally. One of ordinary skill in the art would also have been able to determine when and how long to use the fuel gas per the needs of the process.

Regarding Claim 19, it has been shown to be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce and use fuel gas according to the claimed invention, thus providing the claimed gas outlet means connected to the feed unit of the soda recovery boiler would also have been obvious.

Al of the claimed elements were known in prior art and one skilled in the art would have been capable of combining the elements as claimed with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have at least yielded the predictable result of reducing the amount of purchased fuel and reducing the amount of waste.

The rejections are maintained.

STEVEN P. GRIFFIN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700